

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ROANOKE DIVISION**

MALIK AL-SHABAZZ,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	Case No. 7:22CV00741
)	
v.)	OPINION AND ORDER
)	
J. C. STREEVAL,)	JUDGE JAMES P. JONES
)	
Respondent.)	

Malik Al-Shabazz, Pro Se.

Malik Al-Shabazz, a federal prison inmate confined in this judicial district, filed this action as a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging a prison disciplinary proceeding and loss of good conduct time. He has separately moved for interlocutory injunctive relief. After review of the record, I will deny that motion.

Petitioner titles his submission “Motion for Injunctive Relief.” Mot. 1, ECF No. 2. He alleges that a prison official retaliated against him because of this habeas action. The underlying § 2241 claim contends that Petitioner was wrongfully charged and sanctioned for misuse of texting on his electronic device. In the present motion, Petitioner alleges that the officer who previously charged him for misuse of texting earlier in 2022 brought an additional charge against Petitioner in October

2022, for similar conduct. Petitioner also alleges that officers have been “beating inmates making them withdraw grievances PREA issues lawsuits and etc. They have been setting inmates up by writing false disciplinary reports or planting drugs or knives on them.” *Id.* Petitioner’s motion asks the court to order “the Respondent not to charge Petitioner with harassing charges,” “to stop charging him with text service charges,” and to order “that he not be beaten or set up or have knives or drugs planted on him for filing this § 2241.” *Id.* at 2.

The allegations in this motion are not appropriately raised in a § 2241 habeas petition. Specifically, a motion like this one, complaining about conditions of confinement, is not challenging the fact or duration of Petitioner’s imprisonment and, thus, is not properly before the court in this habeas action. *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973).

For the stated reason, it is **ORDERED** that Petitioner’s motion, ECF No. 2, is DENIED.

ENTER: February 2, 2023

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Senior United States District Judge